



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/699,891

11/04/2003

Mayu Yamada

244823US90

3487

22850

7590

12/09/2008

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
1940 DUKE STREET  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

SAFAIPOUR, BOBBAK

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2618

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/09/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/699,891	<b>Applicant(s)</b> YAMADA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> BOBBAK SAFAIPOUR	<b>Art Unit</b> 2618	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) BOBBAK SAFAIPOUR. (3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) Andrew T. Harry. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 02 December 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,2,6 and 12.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hayama et al. (US 7,006,484).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed proposed amendments to the claims (first option (1) of the agenda faxed to the Examiner). The Examiner agreed that amendments made to the independent claims with regards to the channels (as disclosed on page 11 of the specification) and/or the threshold value for layering for the layering method (as disclosed on page 22 of the specification) will overcome the Hayama reference. However, a further search and consideration is required.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Bobbak Safaipour/ Examiner, Art Unit 2618	/Matthew D. Anderson/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2618
---	---